Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

A grammar of Lumun : a Kordofanian language of Sudan

Smits, H.J.; Smits H.J.

Citation
Smits, H. J. (2017, September 21). *A grammar of Lumun : a Kordofanian language of Sudan*. LOT, Utrecht. Retrieved from https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57165

Version:	Not Applicable (or Unknown)
License:	Licence agreement concerning inclusion of doctoral thesis in the Institutional Repository of the University of Leiden
Downloaded from:	https://hdl.handle.net/1887/57165

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

Cover Page

Universiteit Leiden

The handle http://hdl.handle.net/1887/57165 holds various files of this Leiden University dissertation

Author: Smits, H.J.
Title: A grammar of Lumun : a Kordofanian language of Sudan
Issue Date: 2017-09-21

11. Relative clauses

Relative clauses are clauses that function as modifiers of a noun or pronoun in the matrix clause. Lumun has subject and non-subject relative clauses, and different constructions for a restrictive and a non-restrictive relative clause. Restrictive relative clauses restrict the reference of their head to a subgroup with certain properties; non-restrictive relative clauses just provide additional information.

Relative clauses contain a concord that agrees with the (pro)noun in the matrix clause that they modify. This (pro)noun from the matrix clause functions as subject in a subject relative clause and as a something other than subject in a non-subject relative clause. A locative relative clause uses the (fixed) locative relative **ná** 'where'.

Restrictive relative clauses, whether subject, non-subject or locative relative clauses have the restrictor (**í-**, see chapter 9), non-restrictive relative clauses lack the restrictor.

A special use of non-restrictive non-subject relative clauses is in cleft constructions. Such constructions are discussed in 11.2.4.

11.1. Subject relative clauses

A subject relative clause contains a non-dependent verb. The concord on the verb agrees with the head in the matrix clause. In a restrictive subject relative clause the concord is preceded by the restrictor **í-**:

C-*verb* (non-restrictive)
ɪ-C-*verb* (restrictive)

The verb in a subject relative construction can be an Incompletive, a Completive, the Present of 'be', the copula C-**á** or a complex verb starting with an auxiliary in non-dependent TAM. One non-dependent TAM, the Past, is not used in subject relative clauses. The Past, like its dependent counterpart the Dependent Perfective, is a narrative TAM that must be preceded in the discourse by another verb, if only a verb that provides "background" information about a

state or situation. This is not compatible with use in a relative clause. A verb in a relative clause typically provides background information itself, either as additional information or in order to restrict the reference of its head.

11.1.1. Restrictive subject relative clauses

Restrictive subject relative clauses typically function as attributive modifiers. Examples follow here:

pʊl ɪ-p-aɛ̰̃	'the person who will go'
pʊl ɪ-p-ɔkát cənɛ́	'the person who was here'
pʊl ɪ-p-aṯ-ɔʈəkɔ̂	'the person who will come and eat it'

Restrictive subject relative clauses can modify (pro)nouns from the matrix clause in different syntactic functions. In the first example below **ɔkîn** 'they' is modified; in the second **ɔkakkâ** 'Kakka'; in the third a **maʈɪ̌** 'days'.

ámmá	**ɔ́-kín**	**í-ṯ-á.pɔ́kɔ**	**ṯ-ɔppɔ́ṯ.ɛ**	**ɲacɔk**	**ɪ-cá …**
if	PERS-3A	RES-C-be_beaten:INCOMPL	C-put_on:COMPL	amounts_of_mud	in-head

as soon as those who are beaten have put mud on their heads … (fr. written story)

ŋ-kw-ɪɔṯ.é	**ɔ-kakká**[62]	**í-p-ɛ́rɛ**	**íŋkəlísɪ**
2-C-find:COMPL	PERS-Kakka	RES-C-speak:INCOMPL	English

did you meet the Kakka who speaks English?

ɔ-kʊkkʊ́	**p-aa.t**	**maʈɪ**	**m-ɛʈa**	**ɪ-m-ɛ̰̂.t**
PERS-Kʊkkʊ	C-come:COMPL	days	C-two	RES-C-go:COMPL

Kʊkkʊ arrived two days ago (two days which have gone)

The next is an example with the copula C-**á** 'be':

[62] When the first born child is a girl she is called Kakka. There are therefore many people called Kakka.

pʊl	**ɪ-p-a**	**páʈəʈ̪an**
person	RES-C-COP	rich_person

a person who is a rich

Syntactic position

In case of more attributive modifiers, a relative clause comes last:

ɲʊkʊl	**ɛɲ-ɲ-ɪ**	**ɪ-ɲ-árrán**	**í-ɲ-á.ík**	**ɲ-áppʊʈ̪a**
children	DEM-C-NEARSP	RES-C-young	RES-C-be:PR	C-play:INCOMPL

these small children who are playing

A restrictive subject relative clause can also be placed outside the noun phrase, after the predicate. This is typically done when the relative clause is rather long. In the next example it happens twice: the first relative clause is a modifier of the subject of the matrix clause **nılı** 'leaders', the second of **ʊl** 'people', which functions as object in the first relative clause. Postposition of the relative clauses makes the sentence easier to follow:

a-nılí	**n-ɔ́-mʊ́ʈ̪ʈ̪ʊ́**	**ɪat**	**kín**
CONJ-leaders	C-of-Arabs	find:DEPPRFV	O3A

[í-n-álıkınɛ	**ʊ́l**	**cık**	**ɪ-aʈ̪ər]**
RES-C-stop:INCOMPL	people	VREF	in-roads

[ɪ-úra	**ɔkʊ́ʈɔt**	**tɔ́rrʊ̂]**
RES-(C-)escape:INCOMPL	move_up:DEPINCOMPL	Lumun_country

and the Arab leaders who stopped the people in the roads who were escaping going up to Tɔrrʊ̂ (Lumun homeland) found them (fr. written description)

Independent use of the restrictive relative construction

Like adjectives with the restrictor, and like the anaphoric demonstrative (C-**ɛn**) with the restrictor, a verb phrase with the restrictor can function independently. In the example below, the relative clause **ɪpɛlıkkákɔt** 'who was released' modifies the unexpressed object **pʊl** 'the person' of the matrix clause

akwɔ́kərənnɔ ‘while s/he let’. The object of the matrix clause is understood from the preceding clause.

k-kw-é-ɛlɪkk.ą́ɛ́ pól ém-p-í a-kw-ɔ́kərənnɔ ɪ-p-ɛlɪkkákɔ.t
3-C-IRR-release:PST person DEM-C-NEARSP CONJ-3-let:DEPINCOMPL RES-C-be_released:COMPL

s/he should have released this person and not the one who was released (i.e. and leave the one who was released)

11.1.2. Non-restrictive subject relative clauses

A non-restrictive subject relative clause does not restrict the reference of its head but provides additional information about it. It functions as a predicative modifier:

k-kw-ɔ́cʊrɔ́ṭ.ɛ ɪ-pól p-ɔccɔ́.t kəɣan ɪttɪ ɔ-ṭʊṭ̈ṭ̈ô
3-C-come_across:COMPL in-person C-receive:COMPL name that PERS-Ṭʊṭ̈ṭ̈ʊ

s/he came across a person called Ṭʊṭ̈ṭ̈ʊ

Compare also the following examples, in which the object noun from the matrix clause is modified. The first has a non-restrictive subject relative clause, the second a restrictive:

m-p-ɔcʊmɔ.t máɪt m-untą́ṭ.ɛ nɔ-capó
1-C-take.PLR:COMPL beans C-be_poured_on:COMPL on-ground

I have picked up some beans, which had fallen on the ground

m-p-ɔcʊmɔ.t máɪt ɪ-m-untą́ṭ.ɛ nɔ-capó
1-C-take.PLR:COMPL beans RES-C-be_poured_on:COMPL on-ground

I have picked up the beans that had fallen on the ground

In the following example the presence of a preceding main verb, the absence of a pronoun (clitic) on the verb, and the lack of a conjunction word or clitic between the clauses provide the cue that we are dealing with a modifier of the subject pronoun of the matrix clause, and not an additional main clause. The non-restrictive relative clause comes after the full matrix clause:

m-p-aa.t	**n-n̪ɔ́-mɪɽuk**	**p-áṯṯ-ɔ́ŋáɛ̃ɔ̃**
1-C-come:COMPL	with-at-bush	C-ITVEN:COMPL-urinate:DEPINCOMPL

I come from the bush, having gone to urinate

11.2. Non-subject relative clauses

Non-subject relative clauses are introduced by the copula C-**á**. The same distinction that is found in subject relative clauses between restrictive and non-restrictive relative clause is found in non-subject relative clauses. In case of a restrictive non-subject relative clause, the restrictor precedes the copula. The concord of C-**á** agrees with the noun in the matrix clause that is modified. C-**á** (which is realized low in context) is followed by a (pro)nominal subject and verb which, depending on the verbal TAM, has or lacks a concord:

C-**a** SUBJ (C)-*verb* (non-restrictive non-subject relative clause)
ɪ-C-**a** SUBJ (C)-*verb* (restrictive non-subject relative clause)

The verb in a non-subject relative clause is a Dependent Incompletive, a Completive, the Present of 'be', or a complex verb starting with one of these. So, while a subject relative clause takes the non-dependent Incompletive, the non-subject relative clause takes its dependent counterpart. Compare:

pʊl	**ɪ-p-a.ɽəkɔ**	**n̪ʊɽît**
person	RES-C-eat:INCOMPL	food

the person who eats the food

n̪ʊɽít	**í-n̪-á**	**pʊ́l**	**ɔ́ɽə́kɔ̂**
food	RES-C-COP	person	eat:DEPINCOMPL

the food which the person eats

Predicates with the same structure as the non-restrictive non-subject relative clause (C-**a** SUBJ (C)-*verb*) will be discussed in 11.2.4.

11.2.1. Morpho-phonology and constructions with personal pronouns

Across a morpheme boundary there is often assimilation between adjacent **a** and **ɔ**, either to **a** or to **ɔ** (see, for example, 2.2.8). After

C-**á**, however, whether with or without the restrictor, a sequence **a**-**ɔ** is generally realized as a diphthong: **a** remains, **ɔ** —though to a lesser extent— tends to remain audible as well (first example below). The persona prefix **ɔ́**-, on the other hand, typically coalesces with the vowel of (**ɪ**-)C-**á** (second example). An example is further given with non-geminated **ŋ** after (**ɪ**-)C-**á**, which is regularly deleted (third example).

aʈəpʊ ɪa ɔcaŋ ɔʈəkɔ̂ 'things which the lizards(sp.) eat'
aʈəpʊ ɪa-kʊmáŋ ɔ́ʈákɔ̂ (<**ɪa ɔkʊmâŋ**) 'things which Kʊmaŋ eats'
aʈəpʊ ɪa ŋərrɔ́ŋ ɔ́ʈákɔ̂ 'things which the squirrel eats'

A singular personal pronoun follows (**ɪ**-)C-**á** in its clitic form, a plural personal pronoun either in its clitic or its full form. The clitic form of the 3PL pronoun is not used in this environment. Unlike the initial **ɔ** of a common noun, the persona prefix of the full personal pronouns coalesces with the **a** of (**ɪ**-)C-**á** to short **a**. For this reason I write the relative marker and the full plural pronouns connected (as I do in case of the 2SG clitic).

The table below presents the paradigm of personal pronouns as part of a restrictive non-subject relative clause with a Dependent Incompletive verb. The geminated allomorph of the 2PL pronoun clitic (**nn-** 'you') is used before the vowel-initial verb in this environment. Some length of the nasal is indeed audible here (and mentally experienced by the speakers), disambiguating the 2PL form from the 1SG form.

Table 45 Restrictive non-subject relative clauses with personal pronoun and Dependent Incompletive

	with full pronoun	*with clitic pronoun*
things which I eat		**aʈəpʊ ɪa n-ɔʈəkɔ̂**
things which you eat		**aʈəpʊ ɪaʈəkɔ̂** (**ɪa ŋ-ɔʈəkɔ̂** > **ɪa ɔʈəkɔ̂** > **ɪaʈəkɔ̂**)
things which s/he eats		**aʈəpʊ ɪa kw-ɔ́ʈəkɔ**

things which we (12) eat	**aʈəpʊ ɪarɪt ɔʈəkɔ̂** (< **ɪa ɔrɪ̌t**)	**aʈəpʊ ɪa ɪr-ɔʈəkɔ̂**
things which we (1A) eat	**aʈəpʊ ɪanin̨ ɔʈəkɔ̂** (< **ɪa ɔnɪ́n̨**)	**aʈəpʊ ɪa i̧n-ɔʈəkɔ̂**
things which we (12A) eat	**aʈəpʊ ɪarʊn ɔʈəkɔ̂** (< **ɪa ɔrʊ́n**) **aʈəpʊ ɪarɔn ɔʈəkɔ̂** (< **ɪa ɔrɔ́n**)	**aʈəpʊ ɪa ʊn-ɔʈəkɔ̂**
things which you (PL) eat	**aʈəpʊ ɪanɔn ɔʈəkɔ̂** (< **ɪa ɔnɔ́n**)	**aʈəpʊ ɪa-nn-ɔʈəkɔ̂**
things which they eat	**aʈəpʊ ɪakín ɔ́ʈəkɔ̂** (< **ɪa ɔkîn**)	

The modified noun from the matrix clause can have different syntactic functions in a non-subject relative clause; this function is not related to its syntactic function in the matrix clause. Examples of different syntactic functions in restrictive and non-restrictive non-subject relative clauses (as well as in the matrix clause) follow here.

11.2.2. Restrictive non-subject relative clauses

The modified noun from the matrix clause can be object in the relative clause. Two examples follow here. In the first, **lɔn** 'words' functions as object in the relative clause, in the second, **ʊrrêt** 'lines'.

m-p-ɛllá.t	**lɔn**	**nɔ-cį̨kį̨t**	**ɪ-l-a**	**n-ɔkʊ́ccɛt**	**caʈɪ**	**c-ên**
1-C-not_have:COMPL	words	on-heart	RES-C-COP	1-prepare:DEPINCOMPL	day	C-DEM

I lacked matters in my heart that I do that day (i.e. I did not plan anything that day)

… á-kw-ɔ́n̰-ʊ́mmɔ	**ŋaak**	**á-kw-ɔ́n̰ɔ́t**
… SUBJ-3-IT:DEPINCOMPL-take:DEPINCOMPL	oil	SUBJ-3-rub_at:DEPINCOMPL

í-ʊ́rrɛ́t	**ên-n-ərɪk**	**ɪ-a**	**k-kw-ɔ́kʊrrɔ.t**	**ŋ-kʊrĭn**
in-lines	DEM-C-NEARADDR	RES-(C-)COP	3-C-engrave:COMPL	with-awl

… she must go and take the oil to rub it into those grooves that she has drawn with the awl (App. III, 9-11)

When the relativized noun is part of a prepositional phrase, an absolute preposition is used (see 16.6). Cf. the following pairs of examples. Each time, the second has the non-subject relative clause:

m-p-ɔcʊrárɔt̪.ɛ	**ɪ-ól**	**én-n-í**	**t̪ɔ́ɽî**
1-C-come_across_each_other:COMPL	in-people	DEM-C-NEARSP	T̪ɔɽî

I met with these people in T̪ɔɽî

ʊl	**ɪ-a**	**m-p-ɔcʊrárɔ́t̪.é**	**tít**	**t̪ɔ́ɽî**
people	RES-(C-)COP	1-C-come_across_each_other:COMPL	in:ABS	T̪ɔɽî

the people with whom I met in T̪ɔɽî

m-p-i̧cát̪.ɛ	**na-aɽaŋkal**	**én-n-í**	**méccín**
1-C-lie_down:COMPL	on-bed	DEM-C-NEARSP	yesterday

I slept on this bed yesterday

aɽaŋkal	**ɪ-a**	**m-p-ɪcát̪.é**	**nán**	**méccín**	**w-ɔ́cɔ́ttâ.t**
bed	RES-(C-)COP	1-C-lie_down:COMPL	on:ABS	yesterday	C-break:COMPL

the bed on which I slept yesterday has broken down

In the second example below the relativized noun is part of a comitative construction. The relative construction makes use of the associative marker **á̪t̪ót**. Compare:

k-kw-ɔ́ká.t	**p-ɔ́nó**	**ɪttɪ**	**k-kw-ápəɽə̪t̪̪a**
3-C-be:COMPL	C-have	that	3-C-be_beaten_while_running:INCOMPL

ɔ-kín	**ɔ-pa̪t̪̪-ɔ̂n**
PERS-3A	PERS-person-PL

she should have been beaten while running together with those people (lit.: she had had to be beaten while running together with those people)

ɔ-pa̪t̪̪-ɔ́n	**í-t̪-á**	**k-kw-ɔ́ká.t**	**p-ɔ́nó**	**ɪttɪ**
PERS-person-PL	RES-C-COP	3-C-be:COMPL	C-have	that

k-kw-ápəɽə̪t̪̪a	**ɔ-kín**	**á̪t̪-t̪-ót**	**t̪-á.ccɨɾɔ́-k**	**ŋ.ŋɪn**
3-C-be_beaten_while_running:INCOMPL	PERS-3A	ASS-C-ASS	C-laugh:INCOMPL-O3	with:ABS

the people together with whom she should have been beaten while running will laugh at her because of it (because she is pregnant without having undergone the rite of passage of being beaten while running) (fr. written description)

Possessors can also be relativized. In the second example, with relative clause, the possessor pronoun C-**én** 'their' expresses the possessor relation. Compare:

lị́cɔk	**l-ɔ́-ʊl**	**l-ɔɽəttâ.t**
goats	C-of-people	C-be_eaten:COMPL

the goats of the people have been eaten

ʊl	**ɪ-a**	**lị́cɔk**	**l-ɛn**	**l-ɔɽəttâ.t**
people	RES-(C-)COP	goats	C-POSS3A	C-be_eaten:COMPL

the people whose goats have been eaten (lit.: the people which their goats have been eaten)

There are other ways to relativize possessor-noun constructions, as illustrated in the following examples. In the first example the possessor relation is expressed through a benefactive verb, in the second through the verb 'have'. In the first, the semantic possessor is encoded as object of a benefactive verb in the non-subject relative clause; in the second the possessor is modified by a subject relative clause. The verb **lɔɽəttât** functions as a non-restrictive subject relative clause, adding information about the goats.

ʊl	**ɪ-a**	**lị́cɔk**	**l-ɔɽəttánɛ.t**
people	RES-(C-)COP	goats	C-be_eaten_for:COMPL

people whose goats have been eaten (lit.: people who the goats have been eaten to)

ʊl	**ɪ-ɔ́nʊ**	**lị́cɔk**	**l-ɔɽəttâ.t**
people	RES-(C-)have	goats	C-be_eaten:COMPL

people whose goats have been eaten (lit.: people who have the goats eaten)

11.2.3. Non-restrictive non-subject relative clauses

The modified noun from the matrix clause can be object in the relative clause. Two examples follow here. In the first, **pʊl** 'person' functions as object in the relative clause, in the second, **măn** 'house'. In the matrix clause they function as subject and as object. Like in non-restrictive subject relative clauses, the relative clause comes after the matrix clause, but is not another main clause:

pʊl	**p-ɪɔ.t**	**p-a**	**ʈ̪ʊk**	**ʈ̪-ɔkkwɔʈ̪.ê**
person	C-die:COMPL	C-COP	dog	C-kill:COMPL

the man died, killed by a dog (the man died whom the dog killed)

m-p-ɔnó	**man**	**m-a**	**m-p-ɔkɛrɔ́.t**	**káʈ̪úkəlɪ**
1-C-have	house	C-COP	1-C-trade:COMPL	Kadugli

I have a house, which I bought in Kadugli

Interestingly, in the next example the relative clause has a reason reading, suggesting that the verb **ɔkárɛllɔ** 'bite' takes a double object: the person bitten ('I') as well as the result of the biting (the marks).[63]

m-p-ɔnó	**nɛpɪlá**	**n-á**	**ɔ́ʈ́ék**	**w-ɔ́kárɛ́llɔ.r-ɪn**[64]
1-C-have	marks	C-COP	ants(sp.)	C-bite:COMPL-O1

I have marks because the ants (sp.) have bitten me

The following sentence also makes use of a non-restrictive non-subject relative clause. **nɔʈ̪énʈ̪a** 'of what' is the predicate, **na ŋkwɔnô** 'that you have' modifies the (plural) noun **nəʈ́ê** 'fear' from the matrix clause:

nəʈ́é	**n-ɔ́ʈ̪énʈ̪á**	**n-á**	**ŋ-kw-ɔnô**
fear	C-of_what	C-COP	2-C-have

the fear that you have is for what? (i.e. why are you afraid?)

The construction in the first example below relativizes a possessor phrase (compare the second example below which contains a possessor phrase modifying **ʈ̪ʊʈ́ît** 'food'). The concord on C-**á** is **ʈ̪**, agreeing with **ʈ̪ʊʈ́ît** 'food'. The antecedent, however, is in fact the whole preceding clause 'the food got spoilt just like that'. The possessor element is subsumed in absolute connexive C-**ɛn**, which actually establishes the reference to the antecedent, while the concord (only) establishes grammatical agreement:

---

[63] The sentence forms a tonal minimal pair with an example given in 11.3, which is interpreted as containing the locative relative ná.

[64] Alternative realization: **wɔ́kárɛ́llɔ́rín** (with tone bridge). Both realizations don't need anything to follow.

ṯʊʈít ṯ-ɔkɟtták.aṯɛ nʊṯʊk ṯ-a-rʊn ṯ-ɔmma lɔ́n l-ɛn
food C-get_spoilt:PST for_no_reason C-COP.PERS-12A C-not_know:INCOMPL words C-of:ABS

the food got spoilt just like that, the reasons of which we do not know (lit.: 'the food that got spoiled just like that, which we do not know the words of') (fr. written text)

ɔ-rʊn ṯ-ɔmma lɔ́n l-ɔ́-ṯʊ́ʈít í-ṯ-ɔ́kɟtták.aṯɛ nʊṯʊk
PERS-12A C-not_know:INCOMPL words C-of-food RES-C-get_spoilt:PST for_no_reason

we do not know why the food got spoilt just like that (lit.: 'we do not know the words of the food which got spoilt just like that')

A temporal phrase is relativized in a variant of the standard opening of Lumun stories 'once upon a time …'. The variant with relative clause (first example below) lacks the conjunctive particle **á-.** Compare:

caʈı c-əʈɛk c-ɔká.t cık c-a-áṯərəpɛ́ ana cɟməntɛrɟ …
day C-some C-be:COMPL VREF C-COP-rabbit and hedgehog

once upon a time, the rabbit and the hedgehog … (more lit.: there was some day on which the rabbit and the hedgehog …) (fr. written story)

caʈı c-əʈɛk c-ɔká.t cık a-áṯərəpɛ́ ana cɟməntɛrɟ …
day C-some C-be:COMPL VREF CONJ-rabbit and hedgehog

once upon a time, the rabbit and the hedgehog … (more lit.: there was some day, and the rabbit and the hedgehog …)

The following is also an interesting case, relativizing a comitative construction:

m-p-árəṯʊk p-a-rɔn ṯ-a.îk
1-C-still C-COP.PERS-12A C-be:PR

I am still (staying) with you (for example in answer to the question 'when will you be going?', more lit.: 'I am still being we are')

11.2.4. Cleft constructions: topicalization of a patient, instrument or comitative constituent

Non-restrictive non-subject relative clauses also function in cleft constructions. This cleft-construction topicalizes the patient of an

action by putting it into subject position, however, unlike a construction with a passive verb, without downplaying the agent of the action. The construction focuses the topic (or theme). The construction can also be applied to constituents with instrument role or in comitative construction. Such constituents are typically grammatically encoded as adjuncts, but now function as subject of the copula. The copula is the main verb, linking the subject with a clausal constituent.

The sentences below are full statements answering the questions 'what happened to the man' and 'what happened to the goat', respectively. My consultant (JS) translated the Lumun expressions into English with a passive construction. The topicalized argument is part of the core of the sentence, and not in extraposition: 'C-**a** SUBJ verb' is not a grammatical format for a main clause. Moreover there is regular assimilation across the word boundary, which would not be the case if the 'person' and the 'goat' in the examples below were extraposed. Note also the absence of an object pronoun on the verb 'kill' in the first example below. It is not possible for the topicalized argument to be pronominally referenced in the embedded clause.

The verb used in the embedded clause is a Dependent Incompletive, a Completive, the Present of 'be', or a complex verb starting with one of these. The examples following here have a Completive verb, the last the Present of 'be'.

pʊl	**p-a**	**n̪ʊk**	**n̪-ɔkkwɔn̪.ɛ̂**	[pʊl ᵃβa ðʊ n̪ɔkʷɔðɛ̂]
person	C-COP	dog	C-kill:COMPL	

the man was killed by a dog (lit.: the man is the dog killed)

ŋ̀mŋ̀t	**w-a**	**n̪ʊk**	**n̪-ɔkkwɔn̪.ɛ̂**	[imiɾ a ðʊ n̪ɔkʷɔðɛ̂]
goat	C-COP	dog	C-kill:COMPL	

the goat was killed by a dog (lit.: the goat is the dog killed)

The following sentence could be a reply to someone who says that he likes to have a certain dog. The answer, which makes use of the patient-topicalizing cleft, communicates that the dog cannot be given away because Lalʊ already gave it to somebody else.

ʈʊk	**ʈ-a-lalʊ́**	**p-ɛ́ʈɛt**	**ɔ-lɔ́ttí**
dog	C-COP.PERS-Lalʊ	C-give:COMPL	PERS-Lɔttɪ

the dog has (already) been given to Lɔttɪ by Lalʊ (lit.: the dog is Lalʊ has given to Lɔttɪ)

In the next example a constituent with instrumental role is topicalized, taking up subject function. The sentence can be a reply to the question 'what was done with this stick?'

kurrɔ́ŋ	**é-ŋ-kí**	**k-á**	**píɲɪl**	**p-ɔkkʊttáʈ.ɛ**	**ŋ.ŋɪn**
stick	DEM-C-NEARSP	C-COP	snake	C-be_killed:COMPL	with:ABS

with this stick a snake was killed (lit.: this stick is a snake was killed with)

In this example a comitative constituent is topicalized. It can be an answer to 'where is your brother?':

ɔ-paŋ-k-ín	**p-á-nɟ́n**	**ʈ-á.ík**	**ɟ́n-áʈ-ʈ-ót**
PERS-sibling-C-POSS1	C-COP.PERS-1A	C-be:PR	1A-ASS-C-ASS

my brother is with me

11.3. The locative relative **ná** 'where'

Non-subject relative clauses modifying a noun with locative semantics and expressing that something takes place at that location make use of a different construction. In such cases the locative relative marker **ná** (realized low) is used: **na** SUBJ-(C)-*verb*. **ná** selects the same TAMs as the marker of non-subject relative clause (**ɪ**-)C-**á (**a Dependent Incompletive, a Completive, the Present of 'be', a defective verb, or a complex verb starting with an auxiliary in non-dependent TAM). I represent **ná** with a high tone since its behaviour is compatible with that of a monomoraic element with a high or a rising tone (it cannot receive a high tone from a preceding element; it can only be realized with a high tone due to tone bridge). The choice between a high and a rising tone is arbitrary because the element has no prepausal realization.

The exact phonological and morphological make-up of **ná** 'where' is not clear. Instead of assimilating to **n**, as would be expected (see

2.1.1 in the chapter on phonology), a preceding word-final **t** or **k** undergoes lenition before **ná**, as it would before a vowel-initial word (some examples of this are given in section 2.1.1). Lenition of a preceding **t** and **k** suggests that the locative relative is actually **n-ná**, with a moraic initial nasal. Moreover, at least one speaker spelled it as <ina>, but the presence of a vowel before the nasal was rejected by JS. Writing a vowel might then also point at an underlying form **n-ná**. Length of the nasal is, however, not audible, nor was it intuitively acceptable for my consultant (JS). For this reason I represent the element as **ná**.

In addition, it is not clear whether the element **ná** is itself morphologically complex or not. **ná** could be a realization of C-**á**, which introduces a non-restrictive non-subject relative clause. An argument in favour of this is that **ná** selects the same TAMs as (**ɪ**-)C-**á**. However, if **ná** historically is a realization of C-**á**, it is unclear what the concord **n** would have agreed with. Would Lumun have had locative nouns, like the Bantu languages, perhaps with a **n**-initial locative prefix, relating to the current preposition **nɔ**- 'on, at'? Since a convincing analysis is lacking, I just represent the element as **ná** and gloss it as a single unit.

Like the non-subject relative, the locative relative fuses with the persona prefix (**ɔ́**-) of a following personal pronoun, kinship term or personal name (first example below). It does not fuse with the initial vowel **ɔ** of a common noun:

k-kw-á.ík	**ná-lálô**
3-C-be:PR	where:REL.PERS-Lalʊ

s/he is (at the place) where Lalʊ is

m-p-ɔnó	**nɛpɪlâ**	**na**	**ɔ́ʈɛ́k**	**w-ɔ́kárɛ́llɔ.r-ɪn**[65]
1-C-have	marks	where:REL	ants(sp.)	C-bite:COMPL-O1

I have marks where the ants (sp.) have bitten me

[65] Alternative realization: **wɔ́kárɛ́llɔ́rín** (with tone bridge). Both realizations don't need anything to follow. Tonal minimal pair with an example given in 11.2.3, with non-restrictive non-subject relative construction.

Another example with the locative relative follows here.

m-p-ɔká.t	**ṯáɣʊ**	**na**	**m-p-ɔkwɔntáṯ.ɛ**
1-C-be:COMPL	Ṯaɣʊ	where:REL	1-C-be_born_at:COMPL

I was in Ṯaɣʊ, where I was born

In the following example, the relative clause introduced by **ná** modifies the noun **kaɣən** 'place'. **kaɣən** cannot be left out here, since the benefactive verb **ɔ́nɛ** 'go to' is used: the verb needs an object noun expressing the goal-argument:

… a-kw-ɔ́ŋ.kanṯɛt	**káɣən**	**na**	**k-kw-á.ík**	**p-á.kkwɔ́t**	**karraŋ**
CONJ-3-go_to:DEPPRFV	place	where:REL	3-C-be:PR	C-construct:INCOMPL	wall

and then he goes to the location where he is constructing the wall

In combination with the non-benefactive **ɛ̃́** 'go' the locative phrase **nɔ-kaɣə̂n** 'at place' can be present, but also absent:

… a-kw-ɔ́ŋkat	**(nɔ-káɣən)**	**na**	**k-kw-á.ík**	**p-á.kkwɔ́t**	**karraŋ**
CONJ-3-go:DEPPRFV	on-place	where:REL	3-C-be:PR	C-construct:INCOMPL	wall

and then he goes to the location where he is constructing the wall

ná is commonly used without antecedent:

na	**íkkɔ**	**cík**	**m-p-íkkɔ**	**cık**
where:REL	(2-)sit:DEPINCOMPL	VREF	1-C-sit:INCOMPL	VREF

where you will stay, I will stay
(Ruth 1:16)

k-kw-á.ík	**ná**	**kə́pá**	**k-á.îk**
3-C-be:PR	where:REL	meat	C-be:PR

s/he is (at the place) where the meat is (this expression can be used in the market: the person is in the part of the market where the meat is sold).

Note in the following example that a Present of 'be' is absent in the clause introduced by **ná.** An other example of this was presented above (**kkwáík nálálô** 's/he is where Lalʊ is'). In both cases the subject of the relative clause is human.

m-p-a.nɛ́kɔ	**kʊ́mmʊk**	**na**	**kəllân**
1-C-take:INCOMPL	pot	where:REL	old_woman

I will take the pot to where the old woman is

In order to express ablative ‘from where’, the absolute preposition **ŋŋɪn** ‘with, by, from’ is added:

k-kw-á.kənn-ɪɽɛ	**na**	**k-kw-áa.t**	**ŋ́ŋɪn**
3-C-NEG-say:DEPCOMPL	where:REL	3-C-come:COMPL	with:ABS

s/he did not say where s/he came from